

REMARKS**1. Request for Continued Examination:**

5 The applicant respectfully requests continued examination of the above-indicated application as per 37 CFR 1.114.

2. Rejection of claims 14, 16, 17, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shirai et al. (US 5,550,452):

10 Claim 14 is amended to include the limitation of:

the external induction coil having an effective cross-sectional area substantially smaller than an effective cross-sectional area of the induction coil.

15 Arguments for the amended claim 14 are presented in the next section. Claims 16, 17, and 22 are dependent and should be allowed if claim 14 is allowed.

20 **3. Rejection of claims 1-6, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirai:**

25 In order for a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) obviousness rejection to be valid, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP 2143).

Shirai does not teach or suggest the claim 1 limitations of:

30 a first induction coil installed corresponding to a position of the flat-plate for transforming an electrical power of a power source to an induction magnetic field, and

5

a second induction coil installed inside the housing corresponding to a position of the contact plane for receiving the induction magnetic field through the contact plane in a magnetic induction manner, an effective *cross-sectional area* of the second induction coil being *smaller* than an effective cross-sectional area of the first induction coil;

10 the claim 14 limitation of:

the external induction coil having an effective cross-sectional area substantially smaller than an effective cross-sectional area of the induction coil;

5 or the new claim 23 limitations of:

a first induction coil installed corresponding to a position of the flat-plate for transforming an electrical power of a power source to an induction magnetic field,
10 and

a second induction coil installed inside the housing corresponding to a position of the contact plane for receiving the induction magnetic field through the contact plane in a magnetic induction manner, an effective cross-sectional area of the second induction coil being substantially smaller than an effective cross-sectional area of the first induction coil.

20 Specifically, Shirai does not teach that the peripheral coil (secondary coil 16) is smaller than the power coil (primary coil 14). The cited section (col. 3, lines 27-46) makes no mention of coil area or size. The Examiner seems to assert that since "the cross-sectional size of the second casing 24 is slightly smaller than the cross-sectional size of the first casing 22" (Shirai, col. 6, lines 61-62) the coils contained therein are
25 of different sizes as well. The applicant respectfully questions this logic. How can container size be related to coil area, without mention or suggestion in the art itself?

Shirai does not suggest different coils sizes since each of Shirai's embodiments show lateral movement limiting mechanical connections, e.g. secondary casing 24 sliding into first casing 22 in Figs. 1A & 1B. The Examiner has offered no motivation to modify Shirai to have coils of different size/effective area, and further, the Examiner has not shown how this would be obvious given Shirai's teachings as a whole.

Reconsideration of claims 1-6, 14, and 18 is respectfully requested in view of the arguments and amendments made. Claims 2-6, 16-18, and 20-22 are dependent and should be allowed if claims 1 and 14 are allowed.

5

4. Rejection of claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirai as applied to claims 1-6 and 14-18 above, and further in view of Katabami (US 5,528,002):

10 The applicant argues that Shirai teaches away from this combination because the proposed modification renders Shirai unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, see MPEP 2143.01(V).

15 In every embodiment, Shirai teaches structure where a first casing 24 sheaths into a second, slightly larger, casing 22. This structure inherently prohibits lateral movement of the two casings 22, 24. Shirai's mechanism requires this, specifically, the depressible member 78 relies on this sheathing structure to operate. The depressible member 78 is fundamental to Shirai's invention as it allows the "primary and secondary coils 14 and 16 to come close to each other" (col. 3, lines 29-30) for the purpose of charging.

20

Modifying this sheathing structure, such that

25 the contact plane is substantially smaller than the extents of the flat plate such that the housing can be moved across the flat plate (claim 20)

or

30 a width of the flat-plane is at least twice a width of the contact plane (claim 21)

would make Shirai's depressible member 78 incapable of achieving the

desired action taught in col. 3, lines 10-26, for example.

Reconsideration of claims 20 and 21 is respectfully requested in view of the arguments and amendments made. Claims 20 and 21 are dependent and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.

5. **New Claim 23:**

Claim 23 is introduced. Now new matter is entered.

10

Consideration of claim 23 is respectfully requested in view of the arguments made above.

Sincerely yours,

15

Winston Hsu

Date: 04.12.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

20 Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)